

<p style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold; font-size: 1.2em;">Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;"> Application No. 10/579,661 </td> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;"> Applicant(s) PROSSER, MICHAEL </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;"> Examiner ANDREW YANG </td> <td style="padding: 2px;"> Art Unit 3775 </td> </tr> </table>	Application No. 10/579,661	Applicant(s) PROSSER, MICHAEL	Examiner ANDREW YANG	Art Unit 3775
Application No. 10/579,661	Applicant(s) PROSSER, MICHAEL				
Examiner ANDREW YANG	Art Unit 3775				

All Participants:

(1) ANDREW YANG.

(2) BORIS MATVENKO.

Date of Interview: 1 May 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 1:00pm

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

8-10, 20, 23 and 24

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Claims 8-10, 23, and 24 had improper dependencies and claim 20 had a typo. Attorney fixed the dependencies and the typo.

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Andrew Yang/
Examiner, Art Unit 3775

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)